

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

REMARKS

Applicants herein request an Interview with the Examiner before the first Office Action on the merits.

Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 12-17 have been added. No new matter has been added by way of these new claims because each new claim is supported by the present specification. For example, claims 12 and 13 are supported by the Examples described at pages 17-18 of the specification. Claims 14-17 have support in the specification at page 16, line 20 to page 17, line 5. Thus, no new matter has been added.

Based upon the above considerations, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw all rejections and allow the currently pending claims.

Advisory Action of October 30, 2002 and Issues Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Advisory Action dated October 30, 2002 states that Applicants' arguments filed October 24, 2002, have been considered but are not persuasive. In the Office Action dated August 5, 2002, claims 1, 3-5, and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '498 (JP 10-179498). Also, in the same Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over JP '498 in view of Thies '317 (US Patent 4,464,317). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and the comments in the October 30, 2002, Advisory Action.

The Present Invention and Its Advantages

The present invention is directed to an adhesive mold removing cleaning sheet comprising a liquid-permeable supporting sheet; an active ingredient member comprising a mold removing ingredient, a liquid-permeable adhesive member comprising a hydrophilic adhesive, and an isolating layer (i.e., see claims 1 and 11). The hydrophilic adhesive is at least 30% by weight of the liquid-permeable adhesive member, and the hydrophilic adhesive has a water content of 0.1% to .60% by weight of the adhesive composition. The isolating layer is provided for separating the active ingredient member and said adhesive member. The adhesive member substantially covers one surface of the isolating layer, and the cleaning sheet on use is stuck on the object that is cleaned by applying the adhesive member to the object.

New claims 12 and 13 include another embodiment of the present invention, whereby the isolating layer can be of the spun lace nonwoven type. Further, claims 14 and 15 include an additional embodiment of the present invention, whereby the isolating layer can be made of a high-molecular polyhydric alcohol. One type of high-

molecular polyhydric alcohol is a high-molecular polyethylene glycol (i.e., as recited in claims 16 and 17).

In contrast, none of the features and advantages of the presently pending claims are disclosed by the cited references.

Distinctions over the Cited References

Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to the specification starting at page 13, line 22:

Since the adhesive cleaning sheet of the present embodiment has the active ingredient member isolated from the adhesive member, the mold removing ingredient in the active ingredient member is protected against the attack of the adhesive and thereby prevented from deactivation with time during storage. In particular, the mold removing ingredient is protected from the water content originally present in a hydrophilic adhesive and thus prevented from being seriously deactivated with time. Further, since the mold removing ingredient is kept dry until use, which also improves the storage stability of the mold removing ingredient.

In other words, the present invention uses an isolating layer that will isolate a mold removing ingredient from the adhesive layer, preventing deterioration or effectiveness of the mold removing ingredient.

In contrast to the present invention, JP '498 does not disclose an isolating layer as instantly claimed. Specifically, JP '498 does not disclose an isolating layer that isolates a mold removing ingredient from an adhesive layer. Even the drawings of JP '498 do not disclose this feature of the present invention.

In addition, JP '498 fails to disclose the features of newly added claims 12-17. For instance, claims 12 and 13 (which are directed to the spun lace nonwoven isolating layer) unexpectedly lead to improved dirt and mold removal when compared to the comparative samples (see the specification at page 17, line 16 to page 18, line 8 for the description of the spun lace nonwoven feature; see also Tables 3 and 4 at pages 22-23 comparing the claimed sheets versus the Comparative Examples; see page 24, lines 1-8 for conclusions with regard to the experimental results). JP '498 fails to disclose this feature of claims 12 and 13, as well as the features of claims 14-17 (i.e., high-molecular polyhydric alcohol, high-molecular polyethylene glycol, respectively).

Thus, because there are three requirements to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness, including the requirement of disclosure of all claimed features, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited rejections have been overcome. This is because there is no disclosure in JP '498 that corresponds to all features as instantly claimed (i.e., claims 1, 11, 12, 13, etc.). Further, the cited Thies '317 reference does not account for these deficiencies of JP '498.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with regard to the presently pending claims (including new claims 12-17), and that these rejections have been overcome.

A full and complete response has been made to the Office Action. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Eugene T. Perez (Reg. No. 48,501) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the application by this Amendment.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

John W. Bailey, #32,881

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

JWB/ETP

0649-0706P

Attachment: Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 12-17 have been added.